

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED	INVENTOR	-	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/463,675	05/12/0	0 BEHLER		A	H3033
		The Control	EXAMINER		EXAMINER
IM22/0622 ' JOHN E DRACH			<u> </u>	HARDEE, J	
COGNIS CORPORATION				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2500 RENAI SUITE 200 GULPH MILL:		LEVARD		1751	13
					06/22/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No. 09/463,675

Applicant(s)

Behler et al.

Examiner

John R. Hardee

Art Unit 1751

The MAILING DATE of this communication appea	rs on the cover sheet with the correspondence address		
Period for Reply			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SITTLE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.			
artor or to work in a mailing date of this commun	CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed nication.		
 If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) da be considered timely. 			
Communication.	ry period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of thi		
earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any		
Status 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <i>Apr 23,</i>	2001		
2a) ☑ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This a	action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance closed in accordance with the practice under Ex p	e except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.		
Disposition of Claims	•		
4) 💢 Claim(s) <u>15-30</u>	is/are pending in the application.		
	is/are withdrawn from consideratio		
	is/are allowed.		
	is/are rejected.		
7) Claim(s)	is/are objected to.		
8)	are subject to restriction and/or election requiremen		
Application Papers			
9) \square The specification is objected to by the Examiner.			
10)□ The drawing(s) filed onis/a	are objected to by the Examiner.		
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on			
12) \square The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exam	•••		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
13) \square Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).		
a) □ All b) □ Some* c) □ None of:			
1. Certified copies of the priority documents ha	ve been received.		
2. Certified copies of the priority documents ha	ve been received in Application No		
 Copies of the certified copies of the priority of application from the International Bure 	documents have been received in this National Stage eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).		
*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the standard of a claim for demostic			
(4) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domesti	c priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).		
ttachment(s)			
5) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	18) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s).		
8) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	19) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)		
7) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	20) Other:		

Application/Control Number: 09/463,675 Page 2

Art Unit: 1751

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restriction

1. Applicant's election with traverse of Group 1A in Paper No. 10 is acknowledged. The

traversal is on the ground(s) that the examiner has not cited a relevant legal precedent. This is not

found persuasive because while the examiner does not have at hand any such legal precedents, the

examiner has cited PCT Rules 13.1 and 13.2 which say, in essence, that an obvious or anticipated

invention lacks unity of invention.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

A complete response to the final rejection would include the cancellation of non-elected

subject matter. As no final rejection has been written prior to this one, no cancellation has been

necessary.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. Claims 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weinelt et

al., US 5,880,086. The examiner maintains the rejection.

3. Claims 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weinelt

et al., US 5,880,086 in view of Severns et al., US 5,531,910. The examiner maintains the

rejection.

Application/Control Number: 09/463,675 Page 3

Art Unit: 1751

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed April 23, 2001 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the Weinelt reference teaches that nonionic surfactant and polyol are optional ingredients, that they are therefore unnecessary, and that the person of ordinary skill in the surfactant art would not find it obvious to add both to the disclosed compositions. This is not persuasive because regardless of whether or not the ingredients are mandatory, addition of a non-zero amount of each or both is disclosed in the reference. A prior art reference may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably conveyed to one having: ordinary skill in the art. The pertinence of a prior art reference is not confined to specific working examples. In re Burckel, 592 F.2d 1175, 201 USPQ 67 (CCPA 1979); In re Lamberti, 545 F.2d 747, 192 USPQ 278 (CCPA 1976); In re Mills, 470 F.2d 649, 176 USPQ 196 (CCPA 1972); In re Susi, 440 F.2d 442, 169 USPQ 423 (CCPA 1971). When ingredients are well known and combined for their known properties, the combination is obvious absent unexpected results. In re Crocket, 126 USPQ 186 and In re Pinten, 173 USPQ 801. The person of ordinary skill in the surfactant art would expect combinations of these materials to behave in the same fashion as the individual materials, absent unexpected results.

Applicant argues that the Weinelt reference does not teach applicant's claimed weight ratio. This is not persuasive because, following the teachings of the reference, applicant could make compositions which do meet this ratio. If applicant can demonstrate that the claimed ratio is critical, this would be afforded patentable weight.

Application/Control Number: 09/463,675

Art Unit: 1751

The combination of Weinelt and Severns is attacked based on the perceived inadequacy of the Weinelt reference. Examiner has responded above to the arguments involving Weinelt.

5. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO: MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to the examiner, Dr. John R. Hardee, whose telephone number is (703) 305-5599. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 7:30 until 4:00. In the event that the examiner is not available, his supervisor, Dr. Yogendra Gupta, may be reached at (703) 308-4708.

Art Unit: 1751

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

John R. Hardee

Primary Examiner

April 30, 2001